

Arlington Historic District Commissions

December 21, 2017
Whittemore Robbins House

Final & Approved Minutes

Commissioners Present: M. Audin, C. Barry, M. Bush, C. Hamilton, S. Lipp, S. Makowka C. Tee, J. Worden

Commissioners Not Present: N. Aikenhead, D. Baldwin, M. Capodanno, B. Cohen,

Guests: E. Dellanno, D. Whitney, C. Campbell, M. Campbell, C. Friedman, J. Page

1. AHDC Meeting Opens 8:08pm
2. Appointment of alternate Commissioners:
Pleasant Street Historic District alternates – M. Bush, C. Hamilton, C. Barry
Mt. Gilboa/Crescent Hill Historic District alternates: C. Hamilton, C. Barry
3. Approval of draft minutes from November 16, 2017. C. Barry moved approval with C. Tee revision of changing words on top of page 4 (in a new neighborhood, revised to in an old neighborhood), seconded by M. Audin. Unanimous approval
4. Communication
 - a. 50 Westmoreland Ave. (Campbell) Application for door replacement
 - b. S. Makowka letter of support for Historic Preservation Grant for Jason Russell House. J. Worden moved to support S. Makowka's letter, seconded by C. Hamilton. Unanimous approval.
 - c. Application for cell phone tower replacement at 75 Pleasant Street (CONA Issued)
 - d. Information from cellular company for comments about cell tower at 75 Pleasant Street
 - e. Application for 0 Ravine Street (Perlo) for new construction – C. Greeley will circulate application with Atty. Leone's cover letter. S. Makowka said bifurcating an application has never been done along those lines. S. Makowka believes we should stick with our procedure per the guidelines
 - f. Email from S. Lipp on communication with S. Makowka on project at 17 Russell Street
 - g. Draft minutes from November and correction from M. Bush
 - h. C. Greeley circulated 2018 calendar. M. Bush moved approval, seconded by M. Audin, unanimous approval
 - i. S. Makowka said 159 Pleasant Street had issues with contractors and maybe want to discuss some communication procedures. Also discussed formal sign offs. C. Barry said he met with M. Byrne about accountability and compliance and the solution was for us to work up an affidavit and have the homeowner do a sign-off with us before they grant the occupancy permit.

5. New Business

Hearings (typically last around 20 minutes per application)

8:20pm

- a. **26A Academy Street (Friedman) Formal Hearing re: rear addition on house.** D. Whitney, architect for project gave explanation of plans. Originally, they thought the project qualified for a Certificate of Non-Applicability. After the AHDC explained that it does not qualify for a CONA due to visibility they understood that the formal hearing was required. In addition to electronic materials previously sent, D. Whitney hand submitted additional materials including map from town's website, plot plan, photos and plans. S. Makowka reiterated that it does not qualify for a CONA and needs a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA).

D. Whitney explained that they are making no changes to the front or sides of the existing house. They tried hard to be respectful so that there would be limited visibility of the project from the street. The driveway up the side of the house is private and it is not a point of public access. They are proposing a two story addition off the back of the house. It will have painted wood clapboards, double hung windows to match the existing house, and asphalt shingle roof to match existing conditions. There will be only a glancing view of the corners visible from the street. M. Audin said the porch railing may be visible from a point of public access. The applicant responded to questions stating that the steps off both back and side of the house will be untreated mahogany treads with painted risers, gutters will be aluminum to match the rest of the house, and the windows on the driveway side (1 window) will be Marvin Next Generation Double Hung Clad. S. Makowka said the AHDC guidelines indicate a preference for wood and we do not typically allow clad in a District. The applicant indicated they would be fine with non-clad, all wood windows. Discussion of windows amongst Commissioners. C. Barry asked whether a railing at the proposed basement stairs is necessary. Applicant indicated that, if required, it will be wrought iron. S. Makowka said addition plans on driveway side show wall straight back and he's trying to figure out how you marry the new structure into the existing structure at the corner of the original structure. The applicant indicated that the addition is stepped back and the interior wall is thickened to compensate. So basically the new addition would meet the house at the edge of the existing corner board. In response to a question, the applicant indicated that the overhang on the flat roof protecting the door does not show the gutter return which will be added to return into the original building. The corner board will contain the return. Due to the overhang, D. Whitney indicated that you will see about 8" of the roof extending past the existing house when standing on Academy Street. On the other side it will stick out as well. M. Audin indicated that the proposed rear porch might well be visible. M. Bush did a rough measurement on the plans and thought that the angle does not allow you to see the porch railing but M/ Audin thought that it was the applicant's burden to demonstrate that will not be visible. S. Makowka said that even if slightly visible at an angle, there is not any way that this is a prominent feature since it will be mostly not visible and there are other more prominent elements that are more important for our consideration. The applicant indicated that the proposed porch will have mahogany 4x4s posts and cable railings.

S. Makowka opened the floor to interested parties. The neighbors on both sides are in support of the proposed project.

C. Barry asked if the Commission would want single pane window on the side and they can put storm to match other windows. The idea is to get the windows to match the rest of the house. S. Makowka said we have been adamant on front facades, but in the past when there have been additions we haven't been quite as strict about the

matching window. Still in keeping and not incongruous with the house. The railing for the stairs to the basement is more important to S. Makowka. It is visible and should be a simple wrought iron railing. C. Barry moved approval of proposed addition as submitted subject to the following conditions: 1) the windows on side façade visible from street will be all wood construction (no cladding) and will be painted, 2) the basement stairway railing will be simple black wrought iron, and 3) the basement stairway railing and the detailing of the new addition's eaves where they meet the original house are to be approved by the monitor prior to installation. Seconded by J. Worden. S. Makowka suggested adding an additional condition whereby if the monitor determines the 2nd floor balcony railing (asserted to be not-visible post construction) is visible, he or she shall use their discretion to ensure an appropriate resolution of that element. C. Barry amended his motion to include this language, seconded by J. Worden. All voted in favor of the motion. Monitor appointed - C. Barry

- b. **50 Westmoreland Ave. (Campbell) re: front door replacement.** S. Makowka clarified that this is an informal hearing because we didn't get the application early enough to publicize a formal hearing. The applicant described that the house is a cape house with the existing front door being an engineered Masonite slab and they would like to replace it with a fiberglass door. M. Audin said that, in his experience, the fiberglass molding on the door will not last with the direct sun exposure and could even meld due to solar heat so the applicants might want to explore other options to ensure longevity. S. Makowka said that given existing condition of the Masonite door and the age of the house, a fiberglass door if painted or a wood door would be appropriate and would suggest that the monitor approve the applicant's final decision prior to installation. M. Bush moved that the change was deemed to so insubstantial by the Commission that no public hearing should be required and a Certificate of Appropriateness would be appropriate in this particular case, provided that interested parties be given a 10 day period to comment. Seconded by C. Barry. All voted in favor of the motion to grant a 10 Day Certificate. M. Bush then moved that after the 10 day period has passed and there have been no objections from abutters for replacement of an engineered Masonite slab front door with either a painted fiberglass or painted wood door, to be approved by the monitor prior to installation, that the 10 Certificate of Appropriateness be granted. Seconded by C Barry. All voted in favor. S. Makowka appointed monitor.

7. Other Business

- a. Discussion regarding sidewalks in Historic District. J. Worden said J. Worden, D. Baldwin and M. Audin met with Director of DPW M. Rademacher. They discussed the sidewalk treatment and the planting strip and trees and roots, and presented info to him including some materials in writing. M. Rademacher wanted to read over and digest the information before getting back. J. Worden said they will report back to the Commission as things progress and he was encouraged that they were able to spend an hour.
- b. Discussion regarding large project hearing procedures
- c. Central Street Historic District vacant commissioner seat
- d. M. Audin update on Zoning Recodification Working Group-ZRWG
- e. Discussion on Guidelines update
- f. Commissioner review – C. Barry will review January applications
- g. M. Audin asked for input about homeowners who are allowing contractors to make changes on projects without permission from the AHDC monitor. He has made a form up to make the homeowner responsible to make contact with the monitor.

8. OPEN FORUM

Ordinarily, any matter presented to the Commission under Open Forum will neither be acted upon nor a formal decision made, absent a previously noticed agenda item, but the Commission may make a decision if it deems it appropriate and necessary for the public good.

9. EXECUTIVE SESSION – Discuss potential litigation with Town Counsel

9:30pm Roll Call Taken to Enter Executive Session and to adjourn for the night directly from Executive Session

Voting in the affirmative: S. Makowka, C. Barry, C. Hamilton, C. Tee, S. Lipp, M. Bush, J. Worden, M. Audin, N. Aikenhead

10. REVIEW OF PROJECTS – N/A

11. RETURNED TO PUBLIC SESSION AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:55pm